



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,824	11/06/2001	Andreas Wittman	476-2024.1	8714

7590 09/11/2002

Lee, Mann, Smith,
McWilliams, Sweeney & Ohlson
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,824

Applicant(s)

WITTMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Dung (Michael) T Nguyen

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Paul IP

PAUL IP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 13, it is not clear as how “an optical transmitter incorporating a laser” has the structural relationship with the semiconductor laser claimed in claim 1.

Referring to claim 14, it is not clear as how “an optical amplifier incorporating a laser” has the structural relationship with the semiconductor laser claimed in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson (USPN 3943462).

Art Unit: 2828

With respect to claims 1 and 7, Thompson discloses a semiconductor laser 1 having a light emitting facet with the anti-reflection coating whose thickness is one quarter of the wavelength (Abstract and col.2, l.21-40).

With respect to claims 4 and 10, Thompson discloses a semiconductor laser 1 being a GaAs laser (col.2, l.21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (USPN 3943462) in view of Arao (USPN 6432620).

With respect to claims 2 and 8, Thompson discloses the limitations in the claim except for the coating of SiON:H (hydrogenated silicon nitride oxide). Arao teaches a hydrogenated silicon nitride oxide (col.14, l.5). For the benefit of the coating, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Thompson hydrogenated silicon nitride oxide coating as taught by Arao.

With respect to claims 3 and 9, Arao discloses the coating grown by PECVD (col.14, l.8).

Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (USPN 3943462) in view of Ueno et al. (USPN 6285700).

With respect to claims 5 and 11, Thompson discloses the limitations in the claim except for the coating optical index of 1.83. Ueno et al. teach a SiON coating optical index of between 1.46 to 1.96 (table 1, col.12). For the benefit of a semiconductor laser with an anti-reflection coating on the emission face, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Thompson an optical index greater or equal to 1.83 as taught by Ueno et al.

With respect to claims 6 and 12, Ueno et al. show in figure 3B a coupling is arranged to take place at the minimum of the standing wave.


Communication Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung (Michael) T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-5511 for regular communications and (703) 306-5511 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3329.

Dung (Michael) Nguyen
September 1, 2002


PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800